

4th March 1925]

(h) if the said district board president has not yet interfered in the matter and has no intention to do so, whether the Government have any objection to interfere in the matter and appoint a competent person to be the president of the said Mangalore Taluk Board until the board elects a president of its own?

A.—The Government have no information. A report has been called for.

*Disallowance of contribution to the People's Flood Relief Fund.*

\* 321 Q.—Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the sum of Rs. 125 sanctioned by the Cocanada Taluk Board for the People's Flood Relief Fund has been disallowed by Government while an equal sum sanctioned by the same body for the Central Relief Fund has been allowed; and

(b) if so, the reasons for this discrimination in treatment?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 242.

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ May I ask the hon. the Minister whether he could not trust the People's Flood Relief Fund and could trust only the Central Relief Fund? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I never said I could not trust the People's Flood Relief Fund.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ May I remind him of the answer given last time, Sir? The answer was that there was no guarantee that the amount will be spent on flood relief in South India. May I ask whether the hon. the Minister still holds that opinion? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I did not say I did not trust the Fund authorities.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ May I ask the hon. Minister to refer to the answer? It distinctly stated, I think I am right except for the articles and prepositions, that the reason why Government disallowed the contributions of certain municipalities to the People's Flood Relief Fund was that there was no guarantee that the amount contributed to the People's Flood Relief Fund will be spent on flood relief in South India. May I know whether it is still the opinion of the Government and if so what are the grounds for holding such an opinion? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ That is a different matter. I said there was no guarantee.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ What are the grounds to believe that there was no such guarantee? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ It is a matter of opinion based on a fact, Sir. Government thought that there was no guarantee.”



[4th March 1925]

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Which is a question of fact, Sir?"

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"That there was no man who was responsible for carrying out the objects for which the funds are asked for."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"The hon. the Minister is an Indian, Sir. May I ask him whether an ex-Advocate-General and other prominent Indians are people who cannot be trusted to carry out the objects for which funds are being asked? I am surprised."

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU:—"It is merely a subjective phenomena of the Government or are there grounds for arriving at the conclusion?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I do not think a question can be addressed in that manner. I have already once given my ruling that it must rest entirely with the Government whether they will give any reason for any action of theirs which is the subject of a question: if they decline to give a reason, they cannot be pressed to state why they decline to furnish a reason."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"May I ask if it is the policy of the Government to prohibit local bodies from contributing to institutions associated or connected with private organizations?"

12 noon.

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"It does not follow from the answers given. It is not the policy of the Government to prohibit any local body from giving any grant to any institution associated or connected with private organizations."

### Education.

#### *Pay of teachers under local boards.*

\* 322 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether the scheme abolishing capitation allowance by raising the pay of teachers adequately was given effect to by local boards and municipalities from April 1923;

(b) what are the local bodies that did not give effect to it;

(c) what are the local bodies that did not give at least an equal amount (of capitation allowance) as promotion;

(d) how many local bodies are adopting the scale of pay as fixed in the Government Order;

(e) what are the steps taken by Government to compel local bodies to adopt the scale;

(f) whether Government are not paying to these local bodies contributions calculated according to the scale of pay prescribed in the Government Order; and

(g) if Government have no information, whether they will be pleased to call for the same?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The system of payment of capitation allowance has been abolished by all local boards and municipalities except four. The pay of teachers has been raised either by the grant of a compensatory allowance or by the introduction of a revised scale of pay except in these four local bodies. The local